

California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

Air Quality Work Group Minutes of November 8, 2005 Meeting

The meeting was held from 9:30 am to noon at the Fresno Convention Center. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting participants are attached. The Work Group Convener, Sue Benham, was unable to attend, so Pete Weber covered her items on the agenda. The facilitators of the break-out sessions were Hal Bolen, Mark Keppler, Ken Newby and Pete Weber.

Following introductions and introductory remarks, a power point presentation (attached) provided an overview of the Valley's air quality issues as presented in the white paper submitted to the partnership for its inaugural meeting on September 16, 2005. It was determined that the group would seek to achieve the goals defined in the white paper, namely the development of a ***comprehensive air quality plan*** that:

- Enables the Valley to meet EPA standards and reduce pollution-related health problems to national averages.
 - Significant, measurable progress by 2010
 - Attainment by June 15, 2013;
- Includes all mobile as well as stationary sources and involves everyone in the solution;
- Provides a balanced approach that includes regulation incentives and assistance in consideration of the Valley's ***limited carrying capacity***;
- Is consistent with the achievement of sustainable economic development; and
- Includes a component of public education and constituency development to support implementation of the plan.

Four breakout groups then discussed four key questions. "Votes" were tabulated in all four break-out groups on the third and fourth questions to determine what level of consensus existed on the answers to these questions. These "votes" were not intended to yield definitive conclusions, but rather to advance the dialogue from issues to possible solutions.

Question # 1: What are the criteria we should use to prioritize the emission sources to be addressed? How do we reconcile conflicting criteria?

The discussions generated a broad consensus that the following criteria should be applied. These are not listed in order of importance. The group consensus was that no single criteria should dominate the prioritization of emission sources, but rather that paths should be found that enable the Valley to meet as many of the following seven criteria as possible:

1. Compliance with the Clean Air Act (implicit herein are the health impacts which the CAA aims to address).
2. Sensible cost/benefits (\$'s per to of pollutants removed).
3. Proven Technology.
4. Impact on jobs and economic development objectives.
5. Impact on livability & quality of life (visibility, ability to play outdoors, etc.)
6. Relevance to projected population growth.
7. Timeliness relative to 2013 EPA compliance requirements.

There was discussion of “political feasibility” and “affordability” as possible criteria, but the group decided not to constrain the discussion with these criteria, at least not at this stage. Time horizons were also discussed. Strategic actions can be segregated into those with immediate, mid-term and long-term impact. While there was broad agreement that the Work Group should initially focus on the mid-tem horizon (EPA compliance by 2013), it was agreed that we would want to come back to possible actions with immediate and long-term impact.

Question # 2: Given the agreed criteria, prioritize the highest payoff issues to be addressed?

This discussion produced a list of emission sources to be addressed. While there was some discussion at this stage of the merits of addressing one versus another source, no attempt was made to prioritize sources at this point. The prioritization is implied in the replies to questions three and four.

1. Mobile Sources:
 - a. Diesel truck, buses, heavy construction equipment and off-road vehicles
 - b. Trains, ships and airplanes
 - c. Gross Polluting Vehicles” (GPV’s seen by some as “low hanging fruit”)
 - d. Traffic Synchronization
2. Stationary Sources
 - a. Diesel engines for stationary applications
 - b. Dairies
 - c. Non-Dairy ag production
 - d. Industrial production
 - e. General public (blowers, lawn mowers, fireplaces, etc.)
3. Other
 - a. Sprawl (Indirect Source Rule discussion)
 - b. Green Bldg/Residences

Question #3: Given these priorities, what strategic actions will have the most impact on the high priority emission sources by 2010-2013?

Following some discussion, the break-out groups were asked to “vote”, indicating those strategic actions that would have the greatest potential impact on meeting the goals stated on page one. Each participant was given three votes (Chicago-style election) to place on

the “Highest Priority Strategic Actions” and three votes on “Other important Strategic Actions or “low-hanging fruit”. The voting pattern across the four break-outs suggested three levels of priority. Priority “A” shows those strategic actions that received at least 6 “highest priority” votes and a minimum of nine total votes.

Priority “A”

	Group				
	A	B	C	D	Total
Accelerate replacement/renovation of diesel engines	8/1	3/4	6/0	9/6	26/11
Accelerate removal of gross polluting vehicles	1/6	8/2	2/0	9/0	20/8
Modified eligibility criteria for Carl Moyer Program	7/0	3/4	0/2	2/3	12/9
Indirect Source Rule	0/1	3/2	7/0	2/0	12/3
Flexibility to use grant funds for compliance assistance	7/0	1/0	0/1	1/3	9/4
Regional land use and transportation authority	0/5	3/3		3/2	6/10
Market-based emissions trading	1/0		2/0	3/3	6/3

Priority “B” shows those strategic actions that received between one and four “highest priority” votes and a minimum of 4 total votes. *It should be noted that some of the Priority “B” and several of the Priority “C” proposed strategic actions were not discussed in all the break-outs, which may account for the low votes.*

Priority “B”

	Group				
	A	B	C	D	Total
New mass transit systems	0/3	4/1	0/1	0/5	4/10
Improved rail transportation	2/2	1/0	1/3	0/3	4/8
Increased flexibility for our area (solar pumps)		3/4			3/4
National Fuel Standards			3/1	0/2	3/3
Short sea shipping between L.A. and the Bay Area	1/3			1/0	2/3
Accelerate expansion of H 99			1/2	1/0	2/2
Public education campaign	1/0	0/2	0/2	0/3	1/7
Increased reduction of ag & dairy emissions		1/1	0/4		1/5
Zoning requirements to encourage walkable communities				1/2	1/2
Address transportation “hot spots” other than the main N-S Corridors			1/0		1/0

Priority “C” shows those strategic actions that received no “highest priority” votes.

Priority “C”

	Group				
	A	B	C	D	Total
Intermodal service facilities			0/1	0/1	0/2
Assignment of responsibility for coordination & monitoring SJV Air Quality Plan by a single government entity			0/1		0/1
Urban traffic synchronization	0/1				0/1
Attract & Incent clean industry to the valley		0/3			0/3
Support development of advanced technologies		0/2			0/2
Incent to keep newer trucks/engines in SJV (new law)		0/2			0/2
Increased truck weight capacity	0/3				0/3

Question # 4: What new funding mechanisms should we consider?

There was broad consensus that attainment of 2013 EPA standards in a way that is compatible with sustainable economic development would not be possible without new funding mechanisms that do not exist today. Several new funding mechanisms were discussed, and the groups were then asked to “vote” on those mechanisms that appeared to offer the most promise. There was a line of demarcation between those funding mechanisms that received nine or more votes and a second group of funding mechanisms that received four or less votes.

Highest Perceived Impact

	Group				
	A	B	C	D	Total
Increased funding for Carl Moyer Program.	4	10	2	10	26
Federal and State incentives for clean energy development & use	5	7	2	7	21
Air Quality Empowerment & Enterprise Zone	1	8	3	7	19
Federal and State grants for technology & best practices research	7	2	1	4	14
Emission-based truck toll fees	3	1	2	3	9

Lower Perceived Impact

	A	Group B	C	D	Total
Goods movement funding			4		4
Extending/expanding Incentives for clean vehicles & upgrades (Vehicle & infrastructure)	4				4
Use of SJV as a clean air industry laboratory	3				3
Farm Bill			3		3
Diesel Emissions Reduction Act			3		3
Indirect source rule		1	2		3
Alternative use of funds from eliminated smog check program				2	2
Toll roads (other than emission-based truck toll fees included among "highest priorities")	2				2
Alternative Compliance-Remediation		1			1

Other Topics Discussed

- West Coast Diesel Collaborative
- Goods Movement and State Infrastructure Plan
 - Touches on a lot of work groups
 - No one single entity in charge of goods movement
 - Must try to build a comprehensive strategy
 - Valley must not be left out
- Need for discussion of issues that may have limited impact on 2013 EPA standards, but which have significant longer-term impact and need to start to be addressed now (e.g. high-speed rail).

Next Steps

The AQ Work Group Leadership will use the inputs received at this first meeting as a basis for constructing an agenda for the AQ Work group meeting to be held at UC Merced on the afternoon of December 8, 2005. A draft agenda will be sent to the Work Group the week of November 28 , inviting comments and suggestions.

